REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated January 13, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-5 are rejected to by the Examiner. Claims 6-22 have been withdrawn from consideration. With this response, claims 1 and 5 are amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-4 and 6-22 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,969,718 to Noguchi et al. (hereinafter "Noguchi"). Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noguchi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,327,008 to Fujiyoshi (hereinafter "Fujiyoshi").

The rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Noguchi US Patent 4,969,718 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 5 has been amended into independent form.

Claim 1 recites a liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including "wherein a voltage deviation in the first pixel due to parasitic capacitance of the first pixel electrode is substantially the same as a voltage deviation due to parasitic capacitance of the second pixel electrode." Applicant respectfully submits that Noguchi fails to disclose either explicitly or inherently at least this feature and that accordingly Noguchi does not anticipate claim 1.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and recites all of the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Noguchi fails to anticipate claim 2 at least because of the dependency from claim 1.

Claim 5 recites a liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including "a parasitic capacitance between the second pixel electrode and the second data line is at least three times greater than a parasitic capacitance between the first pixel electrode and the first data line." The Examiner cites FIG. 5A and the accompanying text of Noguchi as teaching these features. Applicant respectfully disagrees that Noguchi et al. inherently or expressly discloses a first parasitic capacitance or a second parasitic capacitance having the recited magnitude.

In the Office Action the Examiner identifies from FIG. 5A "a first pixel electrode (522)", "a second pixel electrode (517)", and "first and second data lines (513, 514) and states that "the distance between the second pixel electrode and the second data is shorter than that between the first pixel electrode and the first data line". The text of the reference is silent about the existence or magnitude of any parasitic capacitance between the parts identified by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's position concerning the magnitude of the first capacitance ignores the conductive pixel electrode between the electrode 522 identified by the examiner as the first pixel electrode and the first data line 513. Applicant submits that the values of the first and second parasitic capacitances in such an arrangement cannot be compared by simply comparing the distance to the respective data lines. Further, Applicant submits that due to the conductive electrode between the first pixel electrode and the first data line there may be no parasitic capacitance element between these components. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Noguchi et al. does not expressly or inherently disclose at least these features of claim 5, and that accordingly claim 5 is not anticipated by Noguchi et al.

The rejection of claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noguchi et al. US Patent 4,969,718 in view of Fujiyoshi, US Patent 6,327,008 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicant respectfully submits that Noguchi et al. and Fujiyoshi analyzed singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims.

As described above, claim 1 is not anticipated by Noguchi et al. The Examiner cites Fujiyoshi as disclosing "applying signals having a same polarity and inverting for each two pixel electrodes." Applicant does not reach the Examiner's contention with respect to the teaching of Fujiyoshi. Applicant respectfully submits that Fujiyoshi does not cure the deficiencies of Noguchi et al. with respect to claim 1, and that accordingly that claims 3 and 4 are allowable over the cited references at least because of their dependencies from claim 1.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendment place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 13, 2006 By Rebecca G. Rudich 4/13/06

Rebecca G. Rudich
Registration No. 41,786

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant